

REMARKS

The drawings are objected to for not showing every feature of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 6-8, 14, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,201,690 to Moore et al. (hereinafter “Moore”) in view of United States Patent Number 5,388,032 to Gill et al. (hereinafter “Gill”), United States Patent Number 5,549374 to Krivec (hereinafter “Krivec”), and United States Patent Number 6,266,236 to Ku et al. (hereinafter “Ku”).

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of January 9, 2007. A proposed amendment was discussed that appears to overcome the Moore reference. The Examiner indicated that the claims with the proposed amendment may be still rejected over additional art upon a further search. As a result, Applicants agreed to include to additional limitations to move the application toward allowance.

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1, 6-8, 14, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore in view of Gill, Krivec, and Ku. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, and 14 to include the limitations of “...a horizontally disposed open rectangle with a first lateral frame connecting only to a proximal end of each longitudinal frame, a second lateral frame connecting only to a distal end of each longitudinal frame, and the first and second lateral frames not impinging on an open interior of the rectangle...” Claim 1 as amended. See also claims 8 and 14 as amended. The amendment is

fully supported by the drawings, which show the second frame as described. Fig. 1, refs, 3511, 3512, 3521, 3522. Because Moore does not disclose a horizontally disposed open rectangle with a first lateral frame connecting only to a proximal end of each longitudinal frame, a second lateral frame connecting only to a distal end of each longitudinal frame, and the first and second lateral frames not impinging on an open interior of the rectangle, Applicants submit that claims 1, 8, and 14 are allowable.

Claims 1, 8, and 14 include the limitation of “...rails fabricated of a lubricious material with a coefficient of sliding friction of less than 0.11...” Claim 1. See also claims 8 and 14. The Examiner cites Krivec as disclosing a lubricous material, polytetrafluoroethylene, which has a coefficient of friction of less than 0.11. However, Applicants submit that there is no suggestion to combine the lubricious material of Krivec with the wheel/rail arrangement of Gill. The Examiner points out that, “Krivec however, is merely cited as evidence that a particular low-friction material is known and used in slide assemblies.” Applicants concede that lubricious material with a coefficient of friction of less than 0.11 is used in slide assemblies. However, absent a suggestion to combine Krivec with Gill, there cannot be a rejection in view of Gill in further view of Krivec. Applicants therefore submit that claims 1, 8, and 14 are allowable.

Applicants have not specifically traversed the rejections of claims 6, 7, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). However, Applicants submit that claims 6, 7, and 22 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that claims 1, 6-8, 14, and 22 are in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the

traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant

Date: January 12, 2007
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929